

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-25 remain in this application.

The examiner has objected to claims 1, 15 and 17 because of informalities.

The examiner stated that claims 1-12 are allowed.

The examiner has objected to claims 14, 16 and 18-25 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The examiner has rejected claims 13, 15 and 17 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by *Hirayama* (6,031,991).

In view of these remarks, reconsideration of the above noted rejections and objections is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections:

Claim 1:

Applicant submits that the above amendments insert the term "other" before "processor" as required by the Examiner, thereby curing this portion of the grounds for the objection to claim 1 due to informalities. However, Applicant respectfully traverses the requirement to delete the term "improvement." If the term "improvement" were to be deleted, then the affected section of claim 1 would be unreadable, since this section recites "In a system ..., an improvement comprising...." Applicant respectfully submits that it is an accepted claim drafting style to claim "an improvement" "in a system." Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this portion of the grounds for the objection to claim 1 due to informalities.

Claims 15 and 17:

Applicant submits that the required corrections to claims 15 and 17 have been made by the above amendments, thereby curing the grounds for the objections to claims 15 and 17 due to informalities.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-12:

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the allowance of claims 1-12.

Claims 14, 16 and 18-25:

Due to the above amendments to independent claim 13 and the remarks (below) regarding the rejection of claim 13 under 35 USC 102(b), Applicant respectfully traverses the objection to claims 14, 16 and 18-25 (all directly or indirectly dependent on claim 13) as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this objection.

Rejections under 35 USC 102(b):

Claim 13:

In light of the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 13 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by *Hirayama*. Claim 13 is currently amended. Amended claim 13 calls for (lines 8-13):

after halting execution of instructions by the one processor, placing each other processor of the system into a debug mode of operation approximately simultaneously with the one processor entering the debug mode of operation by sending an external debug break signal from the one processor to each other processor of the system to cause each other processor to enter the debug mode of operation.

Applicant respectfully submits that *Hirayama* does not teach or suggest "placing each other processor ... into a debug mode of operation" "after halting execution of instructions by the one processor" and does not teach or suggest "sending an external debug break signal from the one processor to each other processor."

Hirayama describes a debug system (Fig. 2) having multiple processors 1a, 1b and 1c in which a processor 1a, 1b or 1c that encounters an error issues a trap signal to other circuitry (detecting section 4 and restart-executing section 5), and the other circuitry then causes all of the processors 1a, 1b and 1c to halt and enter debug mode simultaneously. (column 2, line 53 to column 3, line 8; column 3, lines 24-45; and column 4, lines 29-37) In other words, the other processors are not placed in debug mode after halting execution of instructions by the one processor that encounters the error as recited in claim 13. Instead, all of the processors (the "one" and the "others") are placed in debug mode simultaneously by the restart-executing section 5. Additionally, the one processor that encounters the error does not send a signal to the other processors as recited in claim 13. Instead, the one processor sends the signal (the trap signal) to the detecting section 4. Furthermore, none of the other cited references overcome the deficiencies in *Hirayama*. Applicant respectfully submits, therefore, that independent claim 13 is not anticipated by, is not obvious from, and is patentable over *Hirayama*, since the cited references do not teach the above limitations, including "placing each other processor ... into a debug mode of operation" "after halting execution of instructions by the one processor" and "sending an external debug break signal from the one processor to each other processor."

Claims 15 and 17:

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of claims 15 and 17 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by *Hirayama*. Claims 15 and 17 both


Appl. No. 09/922,755
Amdt. Dated June 30, 2004
Reply to Office action of June 3, 2004

depend from independent claim 13. As explained above, claim 13 is not anticipated by, is not obvious from, and is patentable over *Hirayama*. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 15 and 17 are not anticipated by, are not obvious from, and are patentable over *Hirayama* for the same arguments regarding claim 13, above.

For the reasons specifically discussed above, and others, it is believed that pending claims 1-25 define patentable subject matter. Reconsideration of the previous rejections as they might apply to the pending claims is therefore respectfully requested. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

June 30, 2004
Date

Respectfully submitted,


L. Jon Lindsay
Registration No. 36,855
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

L. Jon Lindsay
1857 W. Spring Water PL
Highlands Ranch, CO 80129
Telephone: 720-344-6189
Facsimile: 928-563-4114